

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,291 (Philyaw) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0058538 (Gudgel) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Gudgel publication, like the Philyaw patent, neither discloses nor suggests a power supply module inserted into an opening of the body of a wireless input device, as claimed, and which forms a part of the housing of the device when the power supply module is inserted into the opening.

As explained during the interview of January 8, 2008, the body of cellular telephone 3702 of Philyaw does not include any sort of opening, as claimed, into which a power supply module can be inserted. This deficiency is not made up for by the Gudgel publication, which also does not disclose any sort of opening in a body of a wireless input device, into which a power supply module is inserted. To the contrary, Gudgel discloses a wireless communications backpack 20 which fits onto a computing device 100, the computing device 100 containing a battery. **Contrary to the Examiner's allegation on page 3 of the Official Action, backpack 20 of Gudgel is not a power supply module, but rather is a wireless communications device, which includes an antenna 30 and a flange for attaching to a portable computing device 100 that lacks wireless communications capabilities.**

It is respectfully submitted that the Gudgel publication does not disclose any sort of power supply module, much less one that fits into an opening in a wireless communications device. Instead, the wireless communications device of Gudgel is arranged to latch onto the back of various computing devices that otherwise lack wireless communications capabilities, *in place of* the conventional battery pack. Element 100 of Gudgel is not a wireless communications device, but rather a computing device to which the wireless communications backpack 20 is attached, and neither element 100 nor backpack 20 includes any sort of opening for a power supply module. Certainly, housing 22 of the wireless communications backpack 20 of Gudgel

Serial Number 10/620,334

includes no such opening, nor does computing device 100, each of the computing device 100 and communications device 20 including their own batteries.

The Examiner's "interpretation" of Gudgel ignores the plain language of paragraph [0027] of the reference:

*...a preferred embodiment of the inventive wireless communications backpack 20 is shown in FIG. 6. Preferably, **backpack 20 comprises a housing 22 which includes flange 24** for attaching the backpack to a portable computing device 100 (FIG. 1), **and an antenna 30** for transmitting and receiving radio frequency signals to and from another transceiver.*

It makes no sense to interpret backpack 20 of Gudgel as a power supply module arranged to be inserted into an opening in a wireless input device when backpack 20 is the only device disclosed in Gudgel that has wireless communications capabilities.

Furthermore, the statement on page 3 of the Official Action that "portable computing device 100 is kind of a wireless pointing device comprising a power-supply module (backpack 20) arranged to be inserted together with battery (102) into an inherent opening of the wireless input device (100) because battery 102 is removable attached to the wireless should be included a hole, cavity or groove to attach to the body of the computer (see 0028, 0029)" makes absolutely no sense. **Contrary to the Examiner's statement, BATTERY 102 OF GUDGEL IS NOT INSERTED INTO AN OPENING IN BACKPACK 20 (which in turn is not inserted into an opening in computing device 100) BUT RATHER IS REPLACED BY BACKPACK 20.** This can easily be understood from a reading of paragraph [0029] of the Gudgel publication:

As best seen in FIGS. 1 and 2, when a portable computing device 100 is used with the inventive backpack 20 the battery 102 (FIG. 4) is replaced with backpack 20

While wireless communications backpack 20 does include its own battery 40, inclusion of a battery in a wireless device such as backpack 20 of Gudgel is not what the Applicant has claimed. Instead, Applicant claimed insertion of a power supply module into an opening in a wireless communications device, which is clearly not taught by Gudgel since Gudgel's wireless communications device, namely backpack 20, does not have a power supply module inserted

Serial Number 10/620,334

therein. In effect, Gudgel's wireless communications device 20 is intended to replace a battery pack such as battery pack 3700 of Philyaw (but only on devices that lack there only wireless communications capabilities). All that Gudgel teaches is to replace the conventional battery pack, which is already shown in the Philyaw patent, and which is strapped onto the back of the housing of the computing device 100 rather than being inserted into an opening therein, with a module that includes wireless communications capabilities. As a result, the Gudgel publication adds absolutely nothing to the teachings of Philyaw and clearly does not make up for its deficiencies.

As noted in the previous **FIVE responses and TWO interviews**, the references of record at best disclose modules that strap onto the back of wireless device housings, and that are not inserted into openings in the housings. **The Gudgel publication is actually even less relevant than the previously applied references since it does not disclose any sort of power pack module for a wireless input device, but rather discloses a wireless device that straps onto the back of a non-wireless computing device.** Accordingly, the latest rejection is clearly in error and withdrawal of the rejection, and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

As to the dependent claims, it is respectfully noted that claims 6 and 8 are clearly not anticipated by the Philyaw patent since these claims recite a computer mouse, trackball, and game controller, none of which are disclosed by either Philyaw or Gudgel. In addition, Philyaw and Gudgel do not even remotely suggest the subject matter of claim 9, which recites that the batteries are “**replaced on the carrier**” (rather than being part of a sealed battery pack) by drawing out the power supply module from the opening as if pulling out a drawer.

Having thus overcome the sole rejection made in the final Official Action, withdrawal of the rejection and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Serial Number 10/620,334

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Benjamin E. Urcia', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Date: July 11, 2008

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\ben\Pending L...P\L\LIN 620334\w06.wpd